

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated **September 11, 2007**. Each issue in the Office Action is addressed below.

§102 Rejections

Claims 61, 63-65, 67, 69-71-72-73 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Crocker et al. (US 5569184).

As to claims 61, 63-65, 67, 69, 71 and 73, it is asserted in the rejection that Crocker (Figs 13-16) shows distal shaft 106, proximal metal hypotube 118, port 108 [in] communication with inner shaft defining guidewire lumen 112, [and] heat shrinkable sleeve 120 having port 108, as recited in the claims. As to claims 70 and 72, it is asserted in the rejection that, from Fig. 15, in a broad sense, port 108 is formed in the region of distal shaft 106 and proximal shaft 118 as well.

To further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art, claim 61 has been amended.

The application should now be in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited. If the Examiner would like to further discuss the case, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: March 11, 2008

By: /William E. Anderson II/
William E. Anderson II
Registration No.: 37766

6640 Shady Oak Dr., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001